

REMARKS

The non-final Office Action of April 5, 2007, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-24 and 29-30 have been amended, and no claims have been cancelled. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-30 remain pending in this application and new claims 31-35 have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Personal Interview

Preliminarily, Applicants would like to thank Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended to Mr. Brisnehan during the personal interview of July 10, 2007. The following remarks include the issues discussed and agreed to during the interview and constitute applicants' report of the substance of interview pursuant to MPEP § 713.04.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,921,170 (*Nevermann*). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Amended claim 29 recites a method of “notifying a user of an occurrence via a cursor control device configured to project image.” *Nevermann*, in contrast, describes a mobile device with an integrated image projector so that the same display shown on the display screen of the device can be projected onto a larger separate surface. (Abstract; col. 1, lines 52-67) Thus, *Nevermann* does not disclose or relate to a “cursor control device” as recited in claim 29. *Nevermann*'s image projector is integrated directly into the mobile device (see FIGS. 1-3), and *Nevermann* does not contemplate using an image projecting system in desktop or other computer systems besides mobile telephones or PDA's consisting only of a single device. Applicants further note that *Nevermann*, which is primarily concerned with achieving a large display area from a small mobile device, specifically teaches away from using separate peripheral devices because doing so would inhibit the mobility of the system. (Col 1, lines 33-44) Accordingly, Applicants submit that *Nevermann* does not disclose, teach or suggest a “cursor control device” as recited in claim 29, nor could it be properly combined or modified with any system that includes cursor control devices.

Additionally, claim 29 has been amended to recite, “receiving a signal from the computer system corresponding to an event occurring in a computer application running on the computer system,” and “in response to the signal received from the computer system, projecting a second image, different from the first image, onto the display region via the cursor control device, wherein the second image is based on the computer application and the event.” As discussed above, *Nevermann* only describes projecting the same content displayed on the display screen of the mobile device onto a nearby surface. (Col. 3, lines 34-39) *Nevermann* does not teach or suggest displaying an image which is based on a computer application and an event, as recited in amended claim 29.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 29 is not anticipated by *Nevermann*. Claim 30 depends from claim 29 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 29, as well as based on the additional features recited therein

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nevermann* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,027 (*Liess*). Claims 3-8, 13-16, and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nevermann*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,552,481 (*Parks*), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,907 (*Liu*). Claims 10 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Nevermann*, in view of *Parks* and *Liu*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,882,331 (*Wu*). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Preliminarily, with respect to claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, and 17-19, Applicants submit that there is no reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill to combine *Nevermann* with *Liess*. The Office Action states on page 3 that it would have been obvious to combine the references, “in order to allow the device can be used as a terminal for worldwide communication network.” This reason or motivation to combine references makes no sense, however, because the relied-upon features of *Liess* (*i.e.*, the integrated optical input device) are completely unrelated to the purported goal of allowing *Nevermann*’s mobile phone to be used as “a terminal for worldwide communication.”

Furthermore, with respect to amended claim 1 as well as dependent claims 9 and 11, Applicants submit that there is no reason to combine *Nevermann* and *Liess*, nor is a combination of the references physically possible to produce a cursor control device, mouse, keyboard, or trackball as recited. As discussed above, *Nevermann* is primarily concerned with achieving a large display area from a small mobile device, and specifically teaches away from using a separate peripheral display device because doing so would inhibit the mobility of the system. (Col 1, lines 33-44)

Additionally, although *Liess*' optical input device can be integrated into a mouse (Col. 6, lines 60-64), this device would be incompatible with *Nevermann*'s mobile phone and image projection system. *Nevermann*'s projection system provides an enlarged display for a small-screen device, but neither reference discloses nor even contemplates a computer mouse with a display screen. Thus, the proposed combination is improper as a piecemeal selection of features from these incompatible references, and is apparently the result of impermissible hindsight by the Examiner, after having benefited from reading Applicant's own disclosure. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 9, 11, 12, and 17-19 are not obvious in view of the proposed combination for the reasons stated above, as well as based on additional patentable features recited within these claims.

Additionally, claim 1 has been amended to recite a communication interface "configured to receive a signal from the computer system corresponding to an event occurring in a computer application," and "wherein the image is displayed by the image projection system in response to the signal received from the computer system and is based on the computer application and the event." As discussed above, *Nevermann* only describes projecting the same content displayed on the display screen of the mobile device onto a nearby surface. (Col. 3, lines 34-39) *Nevermann* does not teach or suggest displaying an image which is based on a computer application and an event, as recited in amended claim 1. Additionally, *Liess* does not disclose or even relate to projecting images, and none of the other cited references teaches or suggests displaying an image based on a computer application and an event. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is not obvious in view of any possible combination of the cited references. Claims 2-23 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

Claim 24 has also been amended to recite a communication interface "configured to receive a signal from the computer system corresponding to an event occurring in a computer

application,” and “wherein in response to the signal received from the computer system the optical projection system is configured to project an image based on the computer application and the event.” Thus, for similar reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 24 is not obvious over any possible combination of the cited references. Claims 25-28 depend from claim 24 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 24, as well as based on the additional features recited therein.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 31-35 to clarify and more fully claim their invention. For example, new claim 31 depends from claim 29 and further recites, “wherein the predetermined condition associated with the computer program corresponds to the receipt of an email message, a voicemail message, a facsimile message, or an instant messaging message.” Claim 32 further recites, “wherein the second image corresponds to a number of received and unopened messages.” Neither the cited portions of *Nevermann*, nor any other portion of any of the cited references that the Applicants have identified, discloses projecting an image upon receipt of a message, or projecting a number of received and unopened messages, as recited respectively in claims 31 and 32.

Claim 33 recites, “wherein the computer program is a scheduling program and the predetermined condition corresponds to a reminder of an upcoming scheduled appointment.” Neither *Nevermann*’s projection system nor any of the other cited references teaches or suggests projecting an appointment reminder.

Claim 34 recites, “wherein the image projected by the cursor control device is different than the image displayed contemporaneously on the display screen.” As discussed above, the image projector in *Nevermann* simply projects whatever content is being displayed on the mobile device display screen at that time, and none of the other cited references contemplate a system in which a different image is projected.

Finally, claim 35 recites, “wherein the housing has a substantially flat bottom surface.” This is in contrast to mobile phone of *Nevermann* which requires a stand (23) to project an image capable of viewing. Applicants also note that claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 35, and that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, recites a projecting device

with a substantially flat bottom surface, “wherein the image projection system is configured and oriented so that the adjacent edge of the image is within 1 mm and 25 mm from the lower periphery,” as recited in claim 12.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: August 6, 2007

By: /Gary D. Fedorochko/
Gary D. Fedorochko
Registration No. 35,509

1100 13th St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3160
Fax: (202) 824-3001